

Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box



PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paper Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

#### TRANSMITTAL **Application Number** 09/832,812 **FORM Filing Date** 4/12/2001 (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) **First Named Inventor** Sarkozy, et al. **Group Art Unit** 2185 **Examiner Name TBD** 82 Total Number of Pages in This Submission Attorney Docket Number STO-05RI

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)									
X	Fee Transmittal Form			Assignment Papers (for an Application)		After Allowance Communication to Group			
	X Fee Attached		X	Drawing(s) - Amended		Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences			
X	Amendment / Reply			Licensing-related Papers		Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)			
	After Final			Petition		Proprietary Information			
	Affida	vits/declaration(s)		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application		Status Letter			
	Extension of Time Request			Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address	X	Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):  e of Litigation			
	Express Abandonment Request			Terminal Disclaimer					
	Information Disclosure Statement			Request for Refund	Notice of Litigation Dismissal Receipt Card				
	Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)			CD, Number of CD(s)					
Response to Missing Par Incomplete Application Response to Missi under 37 CFR 1.5		Missing Parts/ pplication nse to Missing Parts 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	Rema	arks					
	_	SIGNAT	JRE O	F APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR	RAGEN	IT			
Firm or Individual name		Steven H. Slater, Re	eg. No.	35,361					
Signature		1/1/1	vu						
Date		18F	Ep	2002					

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time your are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

PTO/SB/17 (11-01)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0551-0032
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

# FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2002

Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

Applicant Claims small entity sta	tus. See 37 CFR 1.27
TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT	(\$) 5,382.00

Complete if Known					
Application Number	09/832,812				
Filing Date	4/12/2001				
First Named Inventor	Sarkozy, et al.				
Examiner Name	TBD				
Group Art Unit	2185				
Attorney Docket No.	STO-05RI				

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)	FEE CALCULATION (continued)					
X Check Credit card Money Other None	3. ADDITIONAL FEES					
		Entity	Small	Entity		
Deposit Account	Fee	Fee	Fee	Fee	Fee Paid	
Account Number 50-1065	105	130	205	65	Surcharge – late filing fee or oath	
Deposit Account Name  Slatter & Matsil, LL.P.	127	50	227	25	Surcharge late provisional filing fee or cover sheet	
The Commissioner is authorized to: (check all that apply)	139	130	139	130	Non-English specification	1
Charge fee(s) indicated below X Credit any overpayments	147	2,520	147	2,520	For filing a request for ex parte reexamination	1
X Charge any additional fee(s) during the pendency of this application	112	920*	112	920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee to the above-identified deposit account.	113	1,840*	113	1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action	
FEE CALCULATION	115	110	215	55	Extension for reply within first month	
1. BASIC FILING FEE	116	400	216	200	Extension for reply within second month	1
Large Entity   Small Entity	117	920	217	460	Extension for reply within third month	1
Fee Fee Fee Fee Description Code (\$) Code (\$) Fee Paid	118	1,440	218	720	Extension for reply within fourth month	1
101 740 201 370 Utility filing fee	128	1,960	228	980	Extension for reply within fifth month	1
106 330 206 165 Design filing fee	119	320	219	160	Notice of Appeal	1
107 510 207 255 Plant filing fee	120	320	220	160	Filing a brief in support of an appeal	1
108 740 208 370 Reissue filing fee	121	280	221	140	Request for oral hearing	1
114 160 214 80 Provisional filing fee	138	1,510	138	1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding	1
	140	110	240	55	Petition to revive – unavoidable	1
SUBTOTAL (1) (\$)	141	1,280	241	640	Petition to revive – unintentional	
2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE	142	1,280	242	640	Utility issue fee (or reissue)	ŀ
Extra Claims Fee from below Fee Paid	143	460	243	230	Design issue fee	
Total Claims 165 -34**= 131 x \$18 = \$2358 Independent 44 -8**= 36 x \$84 = \$3024	144	620	244	310	Plant issue fee	1
Claims 44 - 5024	122	130	122	130	Petitions to the Commissioner	]
Multiple Dependent	123	50	123	50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(q)	
Large Entity Small Entity	126	180	126	180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
Fee Fee Fee Fee Description	581	40	581	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
103 18 203 9 Claims in excess of 20	146	740	246	370	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(a))	
102 84 202 42 Independent claims in excess of 3	149	740	249	370	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR § 1.129(b))	
104 280 204 140 Multiple dependent claim, if not paid	179	740	279	370	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	
109 84 209 42 **Reissue independent claims over original patent		900	169	900	Request for expedited examination of a design application	
110 18 210 9 **Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent						
SUBTOTAL (2) (\$)5,382.00	Other	fee (spe	cify)			
** or number previously paid, if greater, For Reissues, see above	*Reduc	ced by Bas	sic Filing	Fee Paid	SUBTOTAL (3) (\$)	

SUBMITTED BY		Complete (if	Complete (if applicable)		
Name (Print/Type)	Steven H. Slater	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	35,361	Telephone	972-732-1001
Signature	18			Date	14FE802

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P. 08-99 17950 PRESTON ROAD, SUITE 1000 DALLAS, TX 75252

BANK OF AMERICA NATIONAL ASSOCIATION ALLEN, TX 75013-9619 32-2/1110

2212

2/18/2002

**\$** \*\*5,382.00

Amendment fee for 09/832,812 (STO 05RI)

MEMO

@ 1984 - 2000 INTUIT INC. # 132 1-800-433-8810

·: :;;

Commissioner for Patents Washington DC 20231

Commissioner for Patents

PAY TO THE ORDER OF

# REISSUE LITIGATION **ART UNIT 2185**

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Sarkozy, et al.

Attorney Docket:

STO-05RI

Filed:

4/12/01

Art Unit:

2185

Serial No.: 09/832,812

Examiner:

**TBD** 

Date Hand Delivered: February 19, 2002

Title:

Apparatus and Method for Storing Data with Selectable Data

Protection Using Mirroring and Selectable Parity Inhibition

**Assistant Commissioner of Patents** 

Received

Washington, D.C. 20231

FEB 1 9 2002

Technology Center 2100

# NOTICE OF LITIGATION DISMISSAL

#### Dear Sir:

Attached is an Order of Dismissal regarding United States Patent No. 5,893,919. This patent was the subject of a Complaint for Patent Infringement filed on March 22, 2001 by Plaintiff, Storage Computer Corporation, against Defendants, XIOtech Corporation, Seagate Technology, Inc. (now known as Veritas Software Technology Corporation), and Seagate Technology LLC (for itself and as successor-in-interest to Seagate Technology, Inc.) in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, Civil Action No. 3-01CV0555-M. This litigation was settled and dismissed on December 27, 2001.

Please direct all correspondence to Applicants' attorney below.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven H. Slate

Registration No. 35,361

Slater & Matsil, L.L.P. 17950 Preston Road, Suite 1000 Dallas, Texas 75252 (972) 732-1001 (telephone) (972) 732-9218 (facsimile) ORTGINAL

٧.

U.S. PISTIDOT COURT NORTHERN DUTINGT OF TEXAS

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

§

§

§ § §

§

STORAGE COMPUTER CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

XIOTECH CORPORATION, SEAGATE TECHNOLOGY, INC. and SEAGATE TECHNOLOGY LLC,

Defendants.

S 27 19
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
By Deputy

Civil Action No. 3-01CV0555-M

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Pursuant to the Stipulation of Dismissal by and between plaintiff Storage Computer Corporation and defendants XIOtech Corporation, Seagate Technology, Inc. (now known as Veritas Software Technology Corporation), and Seagate Technology LLC (for itself and as successor-in-interest to Seagate Technology, Inc.), IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

All claims, defenses and counterclaims in the above-captioned action are dismissed with prejudice;

Each party shall bear its own costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees;

All Orders previously entered in this case are vacated; and

This Court will retain jurisdiction to enforce the settlement reached between the parties.

SO ORDERED, this 2/2 day of December 2001

INITED STATES DISTRICT TODO

BARBARA M. G. LYN

Order of Dismissal

## AGREED AS TO FORM AND SUBSTANCE:

Counsel for Storage Computer Corporation

Counsel for XIOtech Corporation, Seagate Technology, Inc. (now known as Veritas Software Technology Corporation) and Seagate Technology LLC (for itself and as successor-in-interest to Seagate Technology, Inc.)

William O. Fifield

SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD 717 North Harwood, Suite 3400

Dallas, Texas 75201

Dated: / Secular 20, 200/

Roderick G. Dorman

HENNIGAN, BENNETT & DORMAN 601 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 3300 Los Angeles, California 90017

Dated: 12 18 0

## REISSUE LITIGATION **ART UNIT 2185**

# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Sarkozy, et al.

Attorney Docket:

STO-05RI

Filed:

4/12/01

Art Unit:

2185

Serial No.: 09/832,812

Examiner:

TBD

Date Hand Delivered: February 19, 2002

Title:

Apparatus and Method for Storing Data with Selectable Data

Protection Using Mirroring and Selectable Parity Inhibition

Received

**Assistant Commissioner of Patents** 

FEB 1 9 2002

Washington, D.C. 20231

Technology Center 2100

# NOTICE OF LITIGATION

Dear Sir:

A Notice of Litigation for this case was previously mailed on January 7, 2002. The Art Unit Number and the Examiner listed on the previous notice were incorrect, however, so Applicants are refiling the notice to ensure that it is placed into the proper file.

. United States Patent No. 5,893,919 is the subject of a Complaint for Patent Infringement filed on October 15, 2001 by Plaintiff, Storage Computer Corporation, against Defendants, Veritas Software Corporation and Veritas Software Global Corporation, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, Civil Action No. 3:01-CV-2078-M. Attached is a copy of the Second Amended Complaint filed on November 30, 2002.

While there is concurrent litigation related to this Reissue Application,
Applicants request that the action in this Reissue Application not be stayed
during the litigation and that this Reissue Application proceed apace.

Please direct all correspondence to Applicants' attorney below.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven H. Slater

Registration No. 35,361

Slater & Matsil, L.L.P. 17950 Preston Road, Suite 1000 Dallas, Texas 75252 (972) 732-1001 (telephone) (972) 732-9218 (facsimile) IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

999999999

STORAGE COMPUTER CORPORATION,

Plaintiff

VERITAS SOFTWARE
CORPORATION and VERITAS
SOFTWARE GLOBAL CORPORATION,

٧.

Civil Action No. 3:01-CV-2078-M

**Defendants** 

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

## SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

§

Plaintiff Storage Computer Corporation ("Storage") files its Second Amended Complaint against Defendant Veritas Software Corporation ("Veritas Corp.") and Veritas Software Global Corporation ("Veritas Global") and as the basis thereof alleges the following:

1. Veritas Corp. and Veritas Global have consented to the filing of this Second Amended Complaint, which comes before any plea, pleading, or answer by Veritas Corp. or Veritas Global.

### NATURE OF THE CASE, JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This action is based on patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281 and seeks damages, injunctive relief and attorneys' fees under 35 U.S.C. §§ 283, 284 and 285. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this suit under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 3. Venue against Veritas Corp. and Veritas Global is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(c) and 1400(b) because each Defendant resides within this judicial district and is subject to personal jurisdiction in this judicial district.
- 4. Veritas Corp. and Veritas Global are subject to personal jurisdiction in this judicial district pursuant to TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE ANN. § 17.042 (Vernon 1997).

Veritas Corp. and Veritas Global are subject to personal jurisdiction in this judicial district because they have directed continuous and systematic activities at this judicial district in the State of Texas, and have, on information and belief, sold infringing products within this judicial district. Additionally, Veritas Corp. has filed a Certificate of Authority with the Texas Secretary of State rendering it subject to suit within this State and judicial district.

## **PARTIES**

- 5. Plaintiff Storage is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 11 Riverside Street, Nashua, New Hampshire 03062.
- 6. On information and belief, Veritas Corp. is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business at 350 Ellis Street, Mountain View, California 94047. Veritas Corp. may be served with process by serving its registered agent in Texas at the registered address, John Beck, 15851 N. Dallas Parkway, Suite 500, Dallas, Texas 75248. If said registered agent cannot be found at the registered address, Veritas Corp. may be served with process by serving the Texas Secretary of State with duplicate copies of summons and complaint, provided that a copy of the summons and complaint are forwarded to Veritas Corp.' principal office in the state in which it is incorporated, 350 Ellis Street, Mountain View, California 94047.
- 7. Veritas Global is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware. On information and belief, Veritas Global has its principal place of business at 350 Ellis Street, Mountain View, California 94047. Veritas Global may be served with process by serving its attorney, David Nelson, Esq., Latham & Watkins, Sears Tower, Suite 5800, Chicago, Illinois 60606.

## **BACKGROUND**

- 8. Plaintiff Storage is the assignee and lawful owner of all right, title and interest in and to U.S. Patent No. 5,893,919 (the '919 patent) entitled "Apparatus and Method for Storing Data with Selectable Data Protection Using Mirroring and Selectable Parity Inhibition."
- 9. The '919 patent was duly and properly issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on April 13, 1999, and is now, and has at all time since its date of issue remained, valid and enforceable. A copy of the '919 patent is attached as Exhibit A.

## **COUNT I**

### PATENT INFRINGEMENT

- 10. Plaintiff incorporates and alleges pars. 1-9 above as if fully set forth herein.
- 11. Defendants have directly infringed, induced infringement by others, and contributed to the infringement of the '919 patent by, inter alia, making, using, offering to sell, and/or selling computer software and other devices which embody the invention of the '919 patent (or its equivalent). It is believed that Defendants will continue to infringe and/or induce infringement unless enjoined by this Court. Defendants' infringement and other actions have caused substantial injury to Plaintiff. On information and belief, each of Defendants' acts were committed knowingly and intentionally and the Defendants' infringement has been willful.

## **DAMAGES**

12. Plaintiff is entitled to damages in accordance with applicable law, including 35 U.S.C. § 284 et seq. The amount of money damages that Plaintiff has suffered due to Defendants' acts of infringement has not been calculated but is subject to proof at trial.

#### RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Storage Computer Corporation demands judgment against Defendants Veritas Corp. and Veritas Global, and respectfully prays for:

- (a) an accounting by Defendants sufficient to determine damages;
- (b) a finding that this case is exceptional pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285
- (c) an award of damages to Storage Computer Corporation from Defendants, jointly and severally, due to Defendants' infringement, contributory infringement and/or inducement of infringement of the '919 patent, and trebling of said award in view of the willful and deliberate nature of Defendants' conduct;
- (d) an award to Storage Computer Corporation of its costs and expenses of suit, including reasonable attorneys' fees for bringing and prosecuting this action;
- (e) an award to Storage Computer Corporation of prejudgment and postjudgment interest;
- (f) orders which preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants from infringing, contributing to infringement, and inducing infringement of the '919 patent, and
- (g) an award to Storage Computer Corporation of such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

A trial by jury is demanded.

Date: 1 - 30 - 0

Respectfully submitted,

William O. Fifield

Texas Bar No. 24005203

Steven C. Malin

Texas Bar No. 12859750

Kathi A. Cover

Texas Bar No. 00793554

Thomas N. Tarnay

Texas Bar No. 24003032

Tung T. Nguyen

Texas Bar No. 24007745

SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD

717 North Harwood, Suite 3400

Dallas, Texas 75201

(214) 981-3300 (Telephone)

(214) 981-3400 (Facsimile)

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF